



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/270,256	03/15/1999	ILYA KLEBANOV	0100.9900440	2265

24228 7590 09/03/2002

MARKISON & RECKAMP, PC  
PO BOX 06229  
WACKER DR  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-0229

EXAMINER

YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/270,256

Applicant(s)

KLEBANOV, ILYA

Examiner

Ryan R Yang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 14, 15 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-13, 16-18, 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/16/02.

This action is final.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14 and 15 are independent claims.
3. The present title of the invention is "Method and Apparatus for Rendering an Image in a Video Graphics Adapter" as filed originally.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1, 3-4, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Moncrief (5,275,565).

As per claim 1, Moncrief discloses a method of displaying active video on a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from a video source ( Figure 3, "a master controller connected to said control input means, said first memory, said maser controller generating signals to cause said first monitor to display a first portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said first monitor", column 12, 63-68, where the master controller is a VGA);

rendering at least a first portion of the first frame of video at the first VGA in response to a first control signal (Figure 4 112a); and

rendering at least a second portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in response to a second control signal (Figure 4 112b, "A slave controller connected to said master controller, said second monitor and said second memory, said slave controller generating signals based upon said reference signal from said master controller and said data in said second memory to cause said second monitor to display a second portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said second monitor", column 13, line 9-16).

6. As per claim 3, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected claim 1, supra, and further discloses the step of rendering at least a first portion of the first frame video at the first VGA includes storing the at least a first portion of the active video in a video memory associated with the first VGA (Figure 4 116a).

7. As per claim 4, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected claim 3, supra, and further discloses the step of rendering at least a second portion of the first frame of video at the second VGA includes the substep of:

storing the at least second portion of the active video in a first video memory associated with the first VGA (Figure 4 116b).

8. As per claim 15, Moncrief discloses a method of displaying active video on a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at a first video graphics adapter (VGA) a first frame of active video from a video source ( Figure 3, "a master controller connected to said control input means,

said first memory, said maser controller generating signals to cause said first monitor to display a first portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said first monitor", column 12, 63-68, where the master controller is a VGA); and

displaying at least a first portion of the first frame of video at a second VGA in response to a second control signal ("A slave controller connected to said master controller, said second monitor and said second memory, said slave controller generating signals based upon said reference signal from said master controller and said data in said second memory to cause said second monitor to display a second portion of said simulated space which is spatially congruent with said second monitor", column 13, line 9-16).

9. As per claim 19, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected claim 15, *supra*, and further discloses the method further comprises storing the first frame of active video in a video memory associated with the first VGA (Figure 4 116a).

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Broemmelsiek (5,574,836).

As per claim 14, Broemmelsiek discloses a processing system for executing instructions, the processor system comprising instructions for:

monitoring the location of an active video window ("The microprocessor 52 then determines the new coordinates of front object 80", column 8, line 33-34);

storing active video data at first video memory ("microprocessor 52 ... draws the front object 80 into the first frame buffer unit 62a", column 6, line 58-60); and

Art Unit: 2672

sending the active video data from the first memory to a second memory when the location of the active video window is associated with the second video memory ("and draws front object 80 into second frame buffer unit 62b in its coordinates in the same way it was drawn into first frame buffer unit 62a", column 8, line 34-36).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moncrief (5,275,565).

As per claim 2, Moncrief demonstrated all the elements as applied to the rejected claim 1, supra.

Since the first portion and the second portion are differ by a reference signal, they could be the same.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

12. Claims 5-13, 16-18 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2672

13. Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 1, applicant argues that Moncrief teaching does not teach that the simulated space is a full frame of video where a first portion is provided on a first screen and a second portion is provided on the second screen. This is not persuasive because the panoramic view disclosed by Moncrief can be considered a frame of video, thus, a portion of which is provided to a first screen and a second portion is provided to a second screen. Since the three monitors are used to display a panoramic view, the views presented to each screen are interdependent. As for rendering, the process is performed by generating polygons (Figure 4 112a, 112b).

As per claim 19, by considering the whole panoramic view as a frame of video, it is clear the Master Controller met the limitation.

As per claim 14, applicant argues the monitoring process is a continuous process, however, there is no limitation that a determining step cannot be a continuous process. As for "sending the active video data from the first memory to a second memory when the location of the active video window is associated with the second video memory", by drawing front object 80 (which is considered an active window) into second frame buffer unit 62b in its coordinates in the same way it was drawn into first frame buffer unit 62a, the two are associated.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2672

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Inquiries***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-6133**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231



Art Unit: 2672


**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ryan Yang  
August 28, 2002



**MICHAEL RAZAVI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**